

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

March 31, 1998

LB 59

a problem between two states. That's what this is about. Next year we decide, well, that wasn't such a good deal after all; we'll get out. Well, let's just don't go into it. I don't need 59. I don't have a lot invested in this. I'm just trying to do the right thing between a boundary between Missouri and Nebraska. We've got landowners down there that are in limbo. They don't know whether they're Missourians or whether Nebraskans. They don't know where to pay their taxes. They're getting a double whammy on their taxes. They're being asked to pay for something not knowing whether to pay it. So all this is trying to do is straighten something out so we don't spend years of litigation and it's got to be eight or ten years, minimum, for this type of thing spending, I've said conservatively, hundreds of thousands of dollars and I think it could run into the millions, all for the sake of some ground that I don't know whether it's extremely valuable, valuable, or less than valuable but I guess most of it's less than valuable. And I think it's logical to have a natural boundary as the boundary so everyone knows where it's at, and if it shifts then we'll talk about it again. It's not thought it will shift, but the real point of it is even in spite of all the sophisticated ways we have to survey and so forth today, it still is a natural boundary that people go by. And if you were going to have a permanent boundary affixed that way, regardless of the land mass, in other words it was going to be on land, you're going to have an increasing job all the time of making markers. Where are those...where...it shifts so you going to go out and move the markers? Who's going to do that? It's an unnecessary expense, if nothing else. So this, to me, serves no purpose to have this amendment in there. If we don't want to do it then we just as well not go into it now and I strongly oppose the amendment. If...and I think Senator Chambers, what was called the attention on page 11 and the top of page 12 does give some recourse. If there's some things that we don't want to do, there's...I can't...I guess I can't find it right...oh. Anyway, wherever it was at. I lost track of it. But this is something that I take seriously because I think it's long term good between the two states, between Missouri and Nebraska. It's been a longstanding...I won't call it a feud, but at least a difference of opinion as to where those boundaries are. We're trying to get it straightened out simply, straightforwardly, and I think this is a way that it should be done. I don't think we need this amendment to